

U.S. Application No. 10/763,651
Reply to Office Action dated July 11, 2005

PATENT
450100-04890

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendment and remarks. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-6, 8, and 13 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 13 are independent. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 13 are hereby amended. Claims 7, 9-12, and 14 are hereby canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 1, 4, 5, and 13 were objected to because of informalities. The present amendment corrects these informalities.

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-6, 8, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,379,133 to Kirk (hereinafter, merely "Kirk") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,037,166 to Malcolm et al. (hereinafter, merely "Malcolm"). Claims 1-6, 8, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,061,083

U.S. Application No. 10/763,651
Reply to Office Action dated July 11, 2005

PATENT
450100-04890

to Aritake et al. (hereinafter, merely "Aritake") in view of Malcolm. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

A three-dimensional display apparatus

...
wherein said display means are vertically shifted so that arrival positions of rays of light passing through said display means, which are not diffracted by said light-condensing means but advance straight, do not coincide with said observing positions. (Emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, Kirk relates to system where a synthetic aperture based sequence of image samples are generated with respect to a subject to be stereoscopically imaged. These sample images are presented to the spaced inputs of a holographic integrated combiner screen to be presented at an output aperture in laterally spaced mutual positioning. The combiner screen may be utilized in conjunction with a holographic optical image combiner architecture which additionally employs a lens assembly such as a projecting lens to generate multi-zone outputs, each zone of which may be presented for stereoscopic viewing at a discrete viewing station.

As understood by Applicants, Malcolm relates to a hologram which is located at an instrument panel so as to reflect or transmit an image from a source located off the panel.

As understood by Applicants, Aritake relates to a system where images of an object are taken from a plurality of angles so as to generate two-dimensional images obtained from the plurality of angles. The two-dimensional images are sequentially displayed in the form of stripes by a displaying device. The two-dimensional images displayed by the displaying device are deflected by a parallel scanning part by a deflection angle dependent on the individual two-dimensional images and supplied to respective virtual apertures.

U.S. Application No. 10/763,651
Reply to Office Action dated July 11, 2005

PATENT
450100-04:390

Applicants respectfully submit that Kirk and Malcolm, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest that display means are vertically shifted so that arrival positions of rays of light passing through said display means, which are not diffracted by said light-condensing means but advance straight, as recited in claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that Aritake fails to provide the disclosure missing from Kirk and Malcolm.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

Independent claim 13 is similar, or somewhat similar, in scope and is patentable for similar, or somewhat similar, reasons.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the above-identified reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

U.S. Application No. 10/763,651
Reply to Office Action dated July 11, 2005

PATENT
450100-04390

CONCLUSION


In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800